



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/814,554

03/31/2004

Richard Warren Hailey

014586-9015-00

7426

1131 7590 06/05/2008
MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP
Two Prudential Plaza
180 North Stetson Avenue, Suite 2000
CHICAGO, IL 60601

EXAMINER

RUTLEDGE, AMELIA L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/05/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/814,554 | Applicant(s) HAILEY ET AL. | |
| | Examiner AMELIA RUTLEDGE | Art Unit 2176 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Amelia Rutledge - USPTO. (3) Kevin Rizzuto - applicant's representative.
 (2) Derek Stettner - applicant's representative. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 03 June 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 25, 34 and 52.

Identification of prior art discussed: Mohr, Shiigi.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed possible ways in which the claims could be amended to overcome the prior art, and compared features of applicant's invention to the prior art of record. The examiner also discussed the current PTO policy on interpreting claims directed to computer apparatus, to determine if they are statutory under 35 USC 101, which requires that the claimed invention cause a functional change (physical transformation) in computer hardware.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Amelia Rutledge/
 Examiner, Art Unit 2176

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action. Examiner's signature, if required